

09/595,647

MS150658.01/MSFTP121US

REMARKS

Claims 1-30 are currently pending in the subject application and are presently under consideration. Claims 1, 3-6, 10-16, 18-22, and 25-28 have been amended herein. A listing of all claims is found at pages 2-6. Claims 3-6, 10-16, 18-22, 25, and 26 have been amended to correct minor informalities. Applicants' representative thanks the Examiner for the courtesies extended during the teleconference of May 25, 2005, in which it was agreed that the herein amendments to claims 1, 27 and 28 and the following comments will place the application in condition for allowance. It is noted that applicants' representative may pursue the original claims in a continuation application. Favorable reconsideration of the subject patent application is respectfully requested in view of the comments and amendments herein.

I. Rejection of Claims 1, 2, 4, 6, 8-19, 21 and 23-30 Under 35 U.S.C. §102(b)

Claims 1, 2, 4, 6, 8-19, 21 and 23-30 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Wright, Jr. *et al.* (U.S. 5,857,201). This rejection should be withdrawn for at least the following reasons. Wright, Jr. *et al.* does not teach or suggest all limitations as recited in the subject claims.

"A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described in a single prior art reference." *Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ 2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987). "The identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the...claim." *Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co.*, 868 F.2d 1226, 9 USPQ 2d 1913, 1920 (Fed. Cir. 1989).

The claimed invention relates to systems and methods for parallel asynchronous command execution. A first computer system is able to request remote procedures via a non-persistent connection. While waiting for completion of remote execution, the first computer is able to perform other tasks and is able to execute a plurality of parallel commands without waiting for results from any particular command. This enables the process to complete even if a network connection is reset and/or temporarily disabled during remote command invocation.

Independent claim 1 recites *a system for parallel asynchronous command execution, comprising ... a first computer system that communicates via a non-persistent connection to*

09/595,647

MS150658.01/MSFTP121US

invoke a remote procedure in a second computer system ... and upon completion of the remote procedure the second computer system generates an event trigger and transmits the event trigger and remote procedure results to the first computer system during a subsequent connection.

Independent claims 17, 18, 23, 24, 27, and 28 recite similar limitations. For example, independent claim 17 recites *a system for parallel asynchronous command execution, comprising ... at least one other computer system [that] upon completion of a remote procedure establishes a non-persistent connection to a first computer.* Wright Jr. *et al.* does not teach or suggest such novel features.

Wright Jr. *et al.* discloses a client and server that “connect for short periods of time to perform a specified operation or set of operations.” (See *e.g.*, col. 6, lns. 47-49) The period of time is referred to as a session and each session “encompasses connecting to the remote host, performing a specific task or set of tasks, and then disconnecting from the host.” (See *e.g.*, col. 6, lns. 54-57). Thus, the operations are performed during a period of time when the client and server are, and remain, connected. Wright Jr. *et al.* does not teach or even suggest a first computer that requests a remote procedure and upon completion of the remote procedure, the second computer transmits an event trigger and remote procedure results to the first computer during, for example, a subsequent connection and/or upon completion of the remote procedure establishing a connection to communicate the results.

Based at least on the foregoing, it is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn and the subject claims allowed.

II. Rejection of Claims 3, 5, 20 and 22 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 3, 5, 20 and 22 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Wright, Jr. *et al.* This rejection should be withdrawn for at least the following reasons. Wright, Jr. *et al.* does not teach or suggest all limitations as recited in the subject claims.

The subject claims depend from independent claims 1, 18, and 23. As discussed *supra*, Wright Jr. *et al.* does not teach or suggest all limitations recited in the independent claims. Accordingly, this rejection should be withdrawn and the subject claims allowed.

09/595,647

MS150658.01/MSFTP121US

III. Rejection of Claim 7 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claim 7 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Wright, Jr. *et al* in view of Azagury, *et al.* (U.S. 6,529,962). This rejection should be withdrawn for at least the following reasons. Neither Wright, Jr. *et al* nor Azagury, *et al.* teach or suggest all limitations as recited in dependent claim 7.

Claim 7 depends from independent claim 1 and, as discussed *supra*, Wright, Jr. *et al.* does not teach or suggest all limitations as recited in independent claim 1 and Azagury, *et al.* does not make up for these deficiencies. Azagury, *et al.* relates to preventing deadlocks during remote calls between a local and a remote computer platform. (See *e.g.*, col. 1, lns. 6-9). A deadlock occurs when two or more threads are unable to continue because they are waiting on each other indefinitely. (See *e.g.*, col. 1, lns. 28-30). Azagury, *et al.* does not teach or suggest *upon completion of a remote procedure a second computer system generates an event trigger and transmits the event trigger and remote procedure results to a first computer system during a subsequent connection...* as recited in independent claim 1. Therefore, Azagury, *et al.* does not make up for the aforementioned deficiencies of Wright, Jr. *et al.*

Based on at least the foregoing, this rejection should be withdrawn and the subject claims allowed.

09/595,647

MS150658.01/MSFTP121US

CONCLUSION

The present application is believed to be in condition for allowance in view of the above comments and amendments. A prompt action to such end is earnestly solicited.

In the event any fees are due in connection with this document, the Commissioner is authorized to charge those fees to Deposit Account No. 50-1063 [MSFTP121US].

Should the Examiner believe a telephone interview would be helpful to expedite favorable prosecution, the Examiner is invited to contact applicants' undersigned representative at the telephone number below.

Respectfully submitted,

AMIN & TUROCY, LLP



Himanshu S. Amin

Reg. No. 40,894

AMIN & TUROCY, LLP
24TH Floor, National City Center
1900 E. 9TH Street
Cleveland, Ohio 44114
Telephone (216) 696-8730
Facsimile (216) 696-8731